

scale the abolition of the death penalty did not lead to an increase in the crimes for which the death penalty had been prescribed. In 1953, there was a Rural Commission report on capital punishment in Britain and they determined after five years study and talking to people from all over the world who are authorities, even judges and wardens from the United States, that the abolition of the death penalty did not lead to an increase in the murder rate or any of the crimes that formally were punished by death. There was a 1968 Senate hearing and a 1972 House Judiciary Sub-Committee hearing where the same findings were made. So when you review the statistics over an extended period of time in societies all over the world whether they are industrial or agricultural, old line societies, relatively new countries, whether they are rich or poor, whether they are flagmatic and solid like certain eastern European countries as they are described by sociologists or hot-tempered like the so-called Latin-American countries are, the circumstances are the same when you deal with the abolition of the death penalty. There is no increase in the rate of the capital crimes. So we come to the situation of asking what is the purpose of the state taking lives? Vengeance, pure and simple. Retaliation, striking back and whereas this may be something understandable if it's done by an individual in the heat of passion, it is totally to be rejected as a social goal for a civilized society. Taking a life cannot restore a life that has been left but taking it can brutalize the entire society. A statement from one of the Supreme Court judges who currently sits said, "Apart from the common charge grounded upon the recognition of human fallibility that the punishment of death must inevitably be inflicted upon innocent men, we know that death has been the lot of men whose convictions were unconstitutionally secured. The punishment itself may have been unconstitutionally inflicted. In comparison to all other punishments today, the deliberate extinguishment of human life by the state is uniquely degrading to human dignity. If the deliberate extinguishment of human life has any effect at all, it more likely tends to lower our respect for life and brutalize our values." That is a statement from one of the judges who voted subsequently to allow legislation to enact the death penalty. Although the judges allowed the death penalty to be enacted by Legislatures from their own position as to the wisdom of it or the social utility, unanimously they said it is unwise. It cannot be shown to deter. It accomplishes no worthwhile social purpose. Judge Blackman stated that if he were a Legislator, he would vote against the death penalty. He said, "I would do all I could to sponsor and to vote for legislation abolishing the death penalty." This is a judge who said the Legislature has the power to enact these laws. Another thing that shows the ambivalence, even on the part of the Supreme Court which has upheld certain death penalties, cases have come to them from Texas and Florida where they have said that these death penalties are legal but the Supreme Court will not allow anybody to be executed. Every case that has come to them since they ruled that certain death penalty statutes are constitutional, the Supreme Court has intervened and said you may enact the law but you may not execute under it. So to do away with the moral flip-flopping, the uncertainty that exists not only in the minds of people like me who are trying to have the death penalty abolished but Senator DeCamp and others who want to see it retained, but on the part of those who administer the criminal